DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 680 UD 016 140

AUTHOR Gordon, Edmund W.; And Others
TITLE Desegregation: (Berkeley, California).
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Communication (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 72
GRANT OEG-71-3946
NOTE 37p.; For full report, see ED 099 458; Part of project entitled Preparation of Publications on Progress in Compensatory Educationad Desegregation Programs

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Board of Education Role; *Case Studies; Class Organization; *Community Involvement; Elementary Schools; Integration Plans; Integration Readiness; *Integration Studies; *Parent Participation; Political Issues; School Districts; *School Integration; Student Characteristics; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *California (Berkeley)

ABSTRACT

Desegregation of the schools in the Berkeley Unified School District has taken place in two stages, each stage reflecting years of political struggles and endless meetings. In 1968, the 12 elementary schools were divided into K-3 and 4-6 schools in four residential zones with approximately 3500 elementary children who live beyond walking distance being bused to school on average of 15 to 20 minutes each way every day. Since that time the majority of Berkeley's staff, parents and students have worked together in various ways to implement total integration: however, most agree that they have not yet reached this goal. But the efforts to replace tracking with heterogeneous classrooms have met with near total success; the ratios of minority staff in teaching and administrative positions have increased significantly, and people are tackling the school board's most recent goals dealing with the development of basic skills for minorities and the elimination of institutional racism. While Berkeley schools are desegregated, not totally integrated, they are staffed, studented, and parented with a significant majority of those who seek to develop "total integration" in their community. (Author/JM)

DESEGREGATION

(Berkeley, California)

Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged
Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

1972

This document was produced as part of the project entitled Preparation of Publications on Progress in Compensatory Education and Desegregation Programs which was funded by the U.S. Office of Education, Dissemination Center for Educational Communication (OEG-71-3946). Points of view or opinions expressed in this material do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the U.S. Office of Education.

Edmund W. Gordon, Project Director
Carolyn Ralston Brownell, Project Coordinator
Jenne K. Brittell, Project Editor

Preface

In efforts at improving the quality of education and at justifying expenditures for compensatory education and school desegregation, we are increasingly dependent upon the data of evaluative research. Yet the data from many of these evaluation efforts conducted over the past twelve years are confused and inconclusive. The findings from these studies are sometimes contradictory. The interpretations have become the subject of considerable controversy, particularly as these findings and interpretations appear to contradict some of our cherished assumptions concerning education and educability. The lack of clarity with respect to the meaning of these data and the value of such programs is in part attributable to a variety of problems in the design and conduct of evaluative research. Among these problems, increasing attention is being called to the fact that there are sparse data concerning the specific nature of program interventions. These tend to be reported under labels or brief descriptions which provide little information relative to the nature and quality of the treatments to which the pupils studied are exposed. In an effort at gaining a better understanding of the content and nature of some of these programs, this project was directed at describing selected programs thought to be exemplary of quality, progress, trends or problems in compensatory education and school desegregation. Ten compensatory education programs and two school desegregation programs were selected for detailed description.

The principal procedures utilized in this study included documentary

analysis, direct observation of programs and interviews with selected informants. The tasks to be accomplished included identification and selection of projects to be studied, collection of all available data on each project considered, field study of promising candidate projects, preparation of descriptive reports, final selection and reporting.

Following is the description of one of these selected programs. For the complete report of this project see document number ED 099 458 in the ERIC system.

Introduction

Desegregation of the schools in the Berkeley Unified School District has taken place in two stages, each stage reflecting years of political struggles and endless meetings. The high school, the only one in the district, has always reflected the population of the district. One junior high school and three of the sixteen neighborhood elementary schools had a student population which included a large percentage of both blacks and whites prior to formal desegregation. The junior high schools were desegregated in 1964. At that time, two of the 7-9 schools were predominantly white, one predominantly black. Subsequently one school became an all-city grade nine, and the other two 7-8. In 1968, the twelve elementary schools were divided into K-3 and 4-6 schools in four residential zones with approximately 3500 elementary children who live beyond walking distance being bused to school an average of 15-20 minutes each way every day. Since that time the majority of Berkeley's staff, parents and students have worked together in various ways to implement total integration; however, most agree that they have not yet reached this goal. But the efforts to replace tracking with heterogeneous classrooms have met with near total success; the ratios of minority staff in teaching and administrative positions have increased significantly; and people are tackling the school board's most recent goals dealing with the development of basic skills for minorities and the elimination of institutional racism. While Berkeley schools are desegregated, not totally integrated, they are staffed, studented; and parented with a significant majority of those who seek to develop "total integration" in their community.

Three main factors have created in Berkeley a desegregated situation conducive to equal educational opportunity: (1) the superintendent and the school board's strength in their main decisions and their involvement of as many staff, community members and students as possible in the planning stages; (2) the concern of staff and community for Berkeley's children; and (3) the board and administration's adoption of a model goal of pluralism involving a real share of power.

Setting

Berkeley's population of approximately 120,000 is rather densely spread over a ten and one-half square mile area between the San Francisco Bay and the hills. Berkeley is a lovely city with many well maintained and occasionally psychedelically-painted older, frame houses in the "flats," the University buildings and grounds, and the more expensive homes and parks in the "hills." Since the University provides jobs for one-third of Berkeley's jobholders, and since its students and faculty lend several definite character flavors to the city, the school's influence is major. It is the University's presence that has enabled Berkeley to become a city of 120,000 without acquiring the industrial atmosphere of Oakland to the South and Richmond to the North. The high cost of real estate makes it difficult for upwardly mobile lower and middle-class citizens to find houses in the community.

The University's presence has not meant, however, that this is an ivory-tower city. In the years after World War II, Berkeley's black population has increased and faced a situation of defacto housing segregation. As the black school population increased during the 1950's to 30%, over

half of the elementary and junior high schools became 90 to 95% black or white. More recently, the Chicano population has increased and resides primarily in one neighborhood, a neighborhood characterized by very poor housing conditions. At times 20% of Berkeley's black population has been unemployed, and 1200 of Berkeley's 15,000 public school children qualify for Title I funds.

Currently, blacks account for over 30% of Berkeley's population and for 45% of its school enrollment. Chicanos make up 3.8% of this enrollment; Asians, 6.3%; whites, 43.3%; and "others" 1.6%. These students are divided among twelve K-3 schools, four 4-6 schools, two 7-8 schools, one 9 school, and one 10-12 high school, and one continuing education high school. Many of the elementary and junior high buildings are old and, although well maintained, will need to be replaced in the not-too-distant future. Portable classrooms are used in many of these sites; some have been in use nearly as long as the schools themselves.

Although Berkeley may reflect a more liberal citizenry than many communities, a city-wide housing ordinance proposal was rejected in 1962, and many recent major office-holders have been politically conservative. However, Berkeley's current five-man school board does reflect the politicized nature of the community. Current members include two blacks, the mayor and assistant mayor are black, and the district containing Berkeley sent a progressive and outspoken black to the U.S. Congress in 1970. Many Berkeley activists, and this category would include a sizable percentage of the population, seem to have gone beyond the rhetoric and may have become experienced in bringing about desired changed both within and without of the institutional structure. Much of this experience was gained in the struggle to desegregate the schools.

Overview

In September, 1958, in response to a letter and a presentation to the school board by the local NAACP seeking racial equality in education, a 16-member citizen's committee was appointed to " study certain interracial problems in the Berkeley schools and their effect on education." On the basis of this committee's report, efforts were made to change the "human relations climate" of the schools through increased hiring of minorities, reassessment of textbook content, and teacher discussions on race relations, but no recommendations regarding desegregation were made. When CORE confronted the now more liberal board with the reality of de facto school segregation in 1962, other citizen groups supported its request for a study and changes. The 36-member committee reflected various racial, economic and occupational interests. The committee presented its findings in October, 1963, eight months after its founding. At a meeting attended by more than 2,000 the committee noted that residential segregation has created racial isolation in the schools; recommended total desegregation; and presented alternate plans for its achievement. A series of public meetings followed with the anti-desegregation forces increasing the vociferous opposition. While a five-member staff committee elaborated a plan based on the recommendations, each school's parent group held meetings to discuss the findings and recommendations, other public meetings continued and staff workshops were conducted. At a May, 1964 meeting, the board unanimously voted to adopt the secondary part of the plan based on the citizen committee's report and the staff revisions and to table the plan for elementary desegregation. More than 3,000 Berkeley citizens attended this meeting

many united in Parents for Neighborhood Schools, a group dedicated to reversing the board's decision to implement the plan.

Supported by the local newspaper, this group did succeed in getting a recall election for board member in October, 1964 which was defeated by a 60% margin. Yet even before the recall vote, the junior high schools were integrated in September, 1964, all reflecting a racial balance of approximately 50% white, 40% black, 8% Asian, and 2% "other." As each family is responsible for the child's transportation after the 7th Grade, no district-supported busing was involved.

Superintendent C.H. Wennerberg resigned in order to study for his Ph.D., and Dr. Neil Sullivan was named his successor in Fall, 1964. Both of these men were committed to total desegregation in the Berkeley schools. This attitude of decisiveness pervaded the predominantly liberal school board and set the style for the developments which preceded the initiation of elementary desegregation. The board agreed to the superintendent's suggestion to appoint yet another citizen's committee to review the school situation. This 138-member Master Plan Committee, which reflected Berkeley's diverse population, was to establish long-term guidelines for the district as well as to suggest short-term solutions. Although this committee's 600-page report was delivered five months after the board had made its final commitment to implement elementary desegregation, its recommendations and its ability to meet and provide guidelines for five years are testimony to the committee's comprehension of educational issues.

Among these recommendations were abolition of the "tracking system." Since this system tended to produce de facto segregation

in the classroom, the committee contended that it reduced pupil self-expectations and teacher expectations.

In the meantime, various activities throughout the district prepared the community for elementary school desegregation. Under Title I funds, 250 black elementary students were bused from the "flats" to the "hill" to reduce class size. Teacher in-service training was expanded, and new emphasis was put on the need for sensitivity toward pupils' feelings about being different and toward others who are different. Afro-American history courses were taught in the fifth grade classes on a city-wide basis in 1967. Berkeley residents voted to substantially increase school taxes at a time when many communities were saying "no" to similar expenses.

Thus, it was with a comparative minimum of community dialogue and after hearing appeals from civil rights and teachers groups for total desegregation, that the board made a commitment in the form of a policy statement in the spring of 1967. A specific plan was to be adopted no later than January, 1968; with actual integration implemented not later than September, 1968. A seven-member district task force worked through the summer, assembling data on how integration could be achieved and analyzing the plans submitted by the community and by institutes and study groups throughout the country. A workshop held by a group composed primarily of blacks who had been involved in the fight for desegregation was attended by the superintendent and became a model for many of the endless community meetings which followed. Parents were encouraged to attend these meetings with total frankness in discussing feelings being the only thing demanded.

The task-force committee tried to remain responsive to faculty and community in-puts. All teachers were given time off to discuss plans and make suggestions. Aware that teacher support was crucial, the administration tried to meet fears directly and to develop in staff members a sense of optimism about the educational challenge presented by a truly pluralistic, integrated setting. The Berkeley Educational Association and the Berkeley Federation of Teachers went on record as supporting immediate desegregation. During the 1967-68 school year, fourteen teachers were hired as regular substitutes, enabling regular teachers to visit and teach in other Berkeley schools. Three-hour small group seminars were held regularly to provide teachers with the opportunity to discuss these visits and to begin to devise their group and individual plans for teaching in integrated classrooms. Numerous demonstration sessions were held.

A committee of 35 staff members met with the superintendent to select an integration plan. The plan they submitted to the board converted the elementary schools into K-3 and 4-6 schools, with implementation necessitating busing of both "hill" and "flats" students. Numerous community meetings preceded the final adoption of the plan, with revisions made at these meetings reflecting the emphasis placed on integrating all grade levels to reflect the district's overall enrollment. A Speakers' Bureau operating out of a newly created Office of Elementary Integration supplied resource speakers, both professional and lay people, for those in the community who wanted to discuss the proposed plan and alternate possibilities.

Several priority concerns came up at these meetings. One was the question of student discipline, with the district responding that special "Help" centers would be established and that principals would personally inform parents of the discipline expectations in each school. Another question concerned the question of classroom heterogeneity, intellectual as well as racial and socio-economic with many parents fearing that their high-achieving, intellectually gifted youngsters would suffer. Responses on this issue referred primarily to the many supplemental programs provided by the district for special needs of particular children, including the state-funded program for gifted children for which approximately 10% of Berkeley students qualify.

Subsequent to the board's adoption of the K-3, 4-6 plan in January, 1968, meetings were held for parents in each attendance zone which contained one 4-6 school. Transportation and boundary aspects of the integration program were discussed and parents encouraged to ask questions. It was explained that the busing pattern would be developed by computers with a card for each school child containing information on age, race, address and school fed to the computer. On the basis of this data the districts' transportation office worked out "ride zones" including routes and stopping points for the 3,500 children to be bused, including those K-3 students who lived over 3/4 mile from their assigned elementary school and those 4-6 students who lived over 1 mile from their assigned intermediate school. Prior to September parents received cards explaining the routes and were given "dry runs" on the buses so that they would know exactly what their child's trip involved. No child's ride exceeds 30 minutes (the average is 15 to 20 minutes), and school times are staggered so that the buses can carry older children first to the intermediate schools and then younger children to the elementary schools.

"Bus aides" were to ride the buses the first few weeks, and late buses would be provided daily for these children wishing to stay at school or visit friends near the school.

Pupil preparation for desegregation included a two-day overnight encampment for all fifth graders with approximately 100 children at each two-day session. Activities at the encampment allowed children of different racial groups to pursue or involve themselves in common experiences. Other activities included a citywide intergroup Youth Council, intra-school student relations committees, grade-level cross school meetings, class discussions on race relations, class exchanges, a few "sensitivity" sessions, school visits and zone-wide play days.

The community was prepared through a monthly paper, the "Tab," beginning in March, 1968 and mailed to every city address and by a precinct-style canvas of the entire city undertaken two weeks prior to implementation by a staff of approximately 500 volunteers. Home meetings were conducted extensively by PTA's, by the Inter-group Education Project, by individual schools and by other community organizations. PTA's organized inter-zone parent meetings, schools held openhouse for the entire community and churches were informed and supportive.

The great majority of the teaching staff received its first choice in terms of teaching assignments, with the staffs of some schools reflecting many changes, generally due to teachers leaving with a principal, and of others almost none. The board mandated that all staff who work with children take a course in minority history and culture and this program was implemented in the spring of 1969 with staff able to choose between the seminar, dramatic performance, problem solving, or encounter group mode of learning.

The above outlines the major events leading to the actual implementation of elementary school desegregation. The commitment of the board and the superintendent to this process was essential. As Berkeley attempts to grapple with the problems of true integration, a similar commitment on the part of the superintendent, Dr. Richard L. Foster, and the present board has been maintained. It is reflected in the following goals and objectives which the board had adopted as emphasis for the allocation of resources for the fiscal year 1972-73:

1. Develop the communication and other basic skills of black and Chicano students.

   We reaffirm our continued commitment to providing a quality program for the wide range of individual differences among all children of all ethnic groups.

2. Develop increasingly comprehensive programs of elementary education.

   We reaffirm the need to deal with the immediate as well as the long range commitments to a quality program for our secondary and adult students.

3. Accelerate effective programs for staff training and development with emphasis on elimination of racism, on human interaction and on understanding among administrators, school staff, students, and community.

Project Operation

As indicated by the first goal enumerated by the school board, individualization is at the heart of the educational process in the Berkeley schools, particularly at the elementary level. With a goal of making schools into "neighborhood centers" reflecting the diversity of the entire school zone, parents are not only participating in actual classroom dynamics, they are deciding which program they want their child in.

In some schools, the choice may be between a Follow Through class, in others between a multi-age or a single-age grouping, in others between a "traditional" and IPL (individualized, personalized learning) and a bicultural classroom in others simply between one teacher's style and another's. In walking from classroom to classroom and from school to school, one sees a wide range of teaching styles, of classroom arrangements, of styles of grouping and of individualization. With the exception of two small "hill" schools (where there is a low percentage of black children and where the percentage will be increased next year), classrooms at this level closely reflect the ethnic populations of the district in terms of ratios. Since parents are given a choice of classrooms it is not always possible to accomodate all parents and maintain the ratios. In such cases, compromises are usually not difficult to reach. Most parents make their choices on the basis of observations of various classrooms and teaching methods.

The personalized instructional approach favored by many of Berkeley's elementary teachers often leads to a classroom structure with desks or chairs spread around the room in various groupings and interest centers, learning centers, and accessible materials lining the walls. Some classrooms also have rows of desks, as certain teachers have discovered that while children's curiosity and intellectual interests are aroused and maintained in the centers, they also like having specific desks belong to them. Others have found that a shelf and a rubber dish pan full of "my things" serves the same purpose. These arrangements are less important than the teachers' responses to learning styles and here there are unifying features which appear in varying degrees in the vast majority

of Berkeley's elementary classrooms. These could be characterized as evidence of pupil involvement in learning activities, evidence of continual adult efforts to identify and respond to individual pupil needs and evidence of a great deal of adult cooperation.

Cooperation in the eight targeted Title I schools which have instructional aides often comes in the form of teachers and aides working together in active efforts to identify and respond to individual children. In other schools a great deal of team teaching takes place; much of it is planned according to curricular areas, but a great deal developing spontaneously as a result of an activity or an idea that evolves on a specific day. Numberous programs which involve secondary students, college students, parents and community members in classroom and individual tutoring add to the number of adults available to the children as resources.

Although there is an air of freedom of movement and spontaneity in these classrooms, it does not follow that teachers are given free rein to "do their thing." As one principal says, "I want the teachers to show me the systematic way they teach kids reading; not just their objectives, but what they're going to do each step of the way." He believes that the self-actualization which he encourages his teachers to strive for in their teaching styles has helped give them the confidence to better apply a systematic method of teaching reading on a personalized basis.

Watching the children in these classrooms as they actively relate to the materials and opportunities made available to them, it appears that this principal is on the right track. However, there are still a number of slow or non-readers in the Berkeley schools, most of them minority

children, and the administration cites the presence of these poor readers as one of Berkeley's major problems. Although reading is given top priority in all elementary schools, approaches vary in terms of materials created and uses as well as in terms of activities. Most teachers work out an individualized reading program for each child, sometimes with the cooperation of a reading specialist. Reading skills centers exist in some schools where children receive individual help from specialists. Peer tutoring may spontaneously develop, especially in the multi-level classes. Principals review individual reading progress and many have scheduled the school day so that teachers have extra time to work with small groups on reading.

Multi-level classes are the norm, both at K-3 and 4-6 schools; rarely do the groups encompass more than three levels. Teachers choose whether they want such a class: more and more teachers are doing so and enjoying the challenging, creative kinds of possibilities such a situation offers. The increased openness and the presence of additional adults, which the neighborhood center concept of a school has helped to create, make such multi-level classes easier to implement. In one school where the sense of staff team work is particularly strong, teachers continually assess individual children's needs in terms of whether they should remain in their present room or whether they might better benefit from another teacher's approach.

Two parent conference days are scheduled each year, at the end of period I and period II of the three marking periods. Progress reports sent home supply the Grade K-6 parent with the child's text level in reading, spelling and math and an indication of his progress in curricular and behavioral areas on a four-point continuum: Excellent Progress;

Satisfactory Progress; Working Below Capacity; and Special Learning Problems. This form provides parents with enough information to discuss the child and his development in a manner helpful to both teacher and parent. Schools close on the day these conferences are scheduled; parent attendance is consistently high.

The busing of these elementary school children has become something so accepted by the children that the question of whether to continue busing or not is not raised. In those schools where hours are staggered for reading groups, it has been possible to arrange small groups without segregation. The bus aides who ride the buses do so only the first few weeks of school; the bus drivers--the majority of whom are minority women--find that they have very few discipline problems.

Berkeley's secondary schools have been formally desegregated for a longer period, grades 7-9 for eight years, and grades 10-12 since the schools were established. However, the community's recent awareness that kids are not receiving an equal education simply by virtue of being in the same school each day has precipitated changes. The usual secondary pattern of required, mixed with elective courses prevails at these levels, and the number of courses related to contemporary American culture and to minorities has increased and diversified over the last ten years. There is now a coordinator of black studies at the high school. In 1970-71 a pilot program in reading skills or "decoding" was developed at one junior high school. Students have one semester of intensive study in a class with two teachers to 15 students. Reading scores improved and currently similar efforts are being stressed in other secondary schools. The high school began its reading lab in February, 1972 and is moving in a similar direction

in math while stressing in-service training in the teaching of basic skills for some staff members. Approximately 130 secondary students are studying at the continuing education school, having been transferred there from the regular system. The program for these 130 students is more personalized than that of the regular high school, with follow up to the home when students are absent and other systematic efforts to show individual concern for students. This population has a higher percentage of blacks (60%) than that of the total school enrollment. Suspensions and expulsions must be approved by the board and are extremely rare.

A major thrust of current efforts has been to make available a wide range of possibilities for all students in such a way that they can relate course material to the concerns of their own lives. The development of alternative schools has been one of the main channels through which this effort has taken concrete shape. The earliest such schools developed at the high school, consisting of groups of 75 to 200 students and 5 to 10 teachers seeking to form communities with negotiated and individualized programs. Demands for ethnic identification eventually led to the formation of a Black House, and, more recently, a Casa de la Raza for Chicano students. In June, 1971, Berkeley received a federal grant to continue expansion of its experimental schools program (district personnel prefer to refer to them as alternative schools). Eventually, 24 schools will be developed; 17 were in operation in Spring, 1972. Four of these schools were situated within elementary schools, seven were on secondary campuses and six were housed in separate quarters. The schools vary a great deal in terms of emphasis, structure and participation; in some the initial

promise has not been realized; others appear to offer few alternatives to the regular structure.

Other special programs abound in Berkeley. An "Equal One" program in a 4-6 school has the children separate into ethnic groups two hours per week so that sensitive issues can be discussed frankly. A Parent-Child Center provides care for infants while their mothers attend high school and also offers classes in child care and related subjects. A Homework Center Program is being developed and community workers will be the main personnel for homework centers established in various homes. In addition to these modest one-school or one-area programs, large scale projects such as Head Start, day care centers and Follow Through continue. The Follow Through project, which uses the Responsive Environment model, illustrates the care taken to maintain a desegregated situation whenever possible. While all children in Head Start and the state-funded preschool project are eligible for Follow Through, principals, teachers, and aides talk to middle-class parents at registration time about the project. Many of these parents choose this program for their children with the knowledge that they will be accepted if they, as parents, make a commitment to become involved in an active way.

While efforts to desegregate classrooms have been successful, it is still obvious that as the children move through the grade levels they tend to segregate themselves socially, although there are many exceptions. Nearly all of the participants in traditional high school extra-curricular activities such as student council and sports are black; this is as much a function of white students "opping out" on these activities as of blacks "taking over." The younger children do not evidence this

degree of extracurricular separation. Although there is occasional scuttlebutt about "racial incidents" in the secondary schools, incidents which do occur infrequently appear to be racially initiated. As several of the elementary schools have very limited playground space, some fighting does occur. However, when the staff has organized games, this fighting has been minimized, indicating it was more likely the result of crowding rather than racism.

The attitude of many of those who deal with "discipline problem" children sheds further light on the Berkeley philosophy. A principal will talk with students after a fight, discuss "why," offer candy, and proceed to ask questions which will elicit a discussion of the "why's" from each point of view, hopefully leading to increased awareness of the sensitivity of human relations. Another assistant principal will occasionally look at a child waiting in the principal's office and say, "Now, why are you here?" disarming the child who assumes he will not get to tell his "side" of the story. A counselor at a 4-6 school who formally worked in the attendance office noted the efforts to work with families and agencies before labeling a child "truant." Similarly, the health consultants work closely with public agencies and clinics and visit families whenever they believe this the best method of working with a child's situation.

When the elementary schools were desegregated, the Title I funded instructional aides were dispersed throughout the district. Since it was felt that this dispersed effort lacked effectiveness, the number of schools receiving these funds was decreased. In addition to instructional aides, these funds are used for community aides, for curriculum assistants, and

for vice principal/coordinators in the "target" schools. State funds during the 1970-71 school year focused on increasing parental involvement primarily through workshops that emphasized parental work with children at home. Through intensive dialogues with teachers and through an extended discussion with administrators, aides have been able to define their role in a manner which lends itself to increased and active participation in classroom activies.

Efforts to achieve the goal of eleminating institutional racism are manifested in the operation of many features of the educational program. Although nearly all classes have been grouped heterogeneously for several years, both ethnically and according to academic aptitude, many teachers feel insecure in the settings and question their own ability to identify and respond to all pupils' needs. Cooperation with aides, specialists, and other classroom volunteers has helped in the situtation, but the need does persist and continued articulation has led to the beginnings of in-service efforts to deal with this problem. The depth of this teacher need became highlighted during the year 1969-70 when the board first formulated the goal of "a year of academic growth for every child for each year spent in the classroom." This commitment forced many teachers to ask themselves if they really were expecting less in terms of academic performance from minority children.

California's "High Potential" program for gifted children who test in the 98th I.Q. percentile provides supplemental funds for special out-of-class activities for the 10% of the Berkeley children who qualify. Aware that the application of this criterion leads to a program with an overwhelming majortiy of white and Oriental students, a process has

considering the number of minority certified candidates available at the present time. While several of the experimental schools and the pre-schools are staffed predominantly by minority staff this does not appear to reflect a tendency to provide supplemental or "dead end" positions. In fact, when previous such programs have been phased out, staff has been retained in other positions, and, when a financial crisis faced the district in 1970-71, the releasing of teachers was ruled out as a money-saving devide. Nine of the 21 principals are from minority groups (six black, three Oriental) and four of the twelve assistant principals are from minority groups. The positions of Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Business Manager, Human Relations Director and similar high-level central administrative positions are held by blacks. The staffs of all regular schools reflect the over-all staff ratio, and teachers seem to feel that they have a say in their assignments. The high school counseling staff includes a large number of minority members as this has proven to be an area where a student's personal identification can be essential in the counseling relationship. There are a number of Spanish bi-lingual teachers working in full and part time bilingual programs, though there are few, if any, Chicanos in higher administrative positions.

Berkeley has succeeded in achieving a nation-wide reputation for providing stimulating teaching and learning situations, and more applications are received than positions available. The current freeze on hiring necessitated by the budget crisis has slowed down the board's policy of moving toward a "staff representation more proportionate to the racial composition of student body and community."

A plethora of workshops, in-service sessions and meetings is available for teachers in Berkeley's various schools and special programs.

These are often "how-to" sessions, emphasizing a particular approach or specific materials. Principals appear to be aware of their staff's individual strengths and weaknesses and work to minimize and eventually to correct these weaknesses. All certified and classified personnel have taken a course in minority history and culture planned by their representatives along with student and community groups. However, this program did not intend to deal fully with the problem of heterogeneous classes. Since there is a dirth of relevant materials for the teaching of such classes, in-service training sessions will have to be somewhat experimental, with a great deal of local planning.

Of the more than 150 instructional aides, the majority are black and female. Though few aides have taken advantage of the COP to become certified teachers, this does not indicate a lack of continuing interest in the educational process. Prospective aides should have a child in the school in which they intend to work. Thus, the aides can provide classroom teachers with daily professional association with a parent/colleague.

Berkeley's two teacher associations, the Berkeley Education Association and the Berkeley Federation of Teachers, represent approximately 900 of Berkeley's 1050 certified personnel. The supportive role taken by these organizations in the process of desegregating and increasing minority staff has meant that Berkeley has been free from the strifes involving unions which often accompany such major changes. They also demanded that no staff be released during the budget crisis when a last-hired, first-fired policy would have led to the release of many minority staff members. Although the top leadership of both organizations is white, minority members in a representative ratio sit on their executive councils.

Black ACES, a recently formed organization of black certified personnel, has assumed a more activist role in activities such as investigating the placement of children in educationally handicapped classes.

Students

Berkeley's student population rather accurately reflects the ethnic and social diversity of the community. The more than 10% who qualify for the "gifted" program, nearly all white and Oriental, indicate that the system has a high proportion of such students compared to the country as a whole. On the other end of the scale, many youngsters, the overwhelming majority of whom are black and Chicano, reach secondary schools without acquiring the basic skills, indicating the presence of those deteriorating urban conditions, both in-school and out-of-school which have resulted in such non-readers.

Because of the University a large counterculture exists in Berkeley, and this has contributed to this atmosphere at the high school. The overwhelming majority of these students who flirt with alternate life styles are white middle and upper-middle class, though the tendency to cut classes seems to permeate almost all ethnic groups. While cutting is not a grave problem in the elementary schools, in contrast to the high school's 40%-50% absentee rate, these children too are amazingly sophisticated vis-a-vis current political and social issues. This sophistication, plus the day-to-day racial contact which began in 1968, has created a situation in which children of all ages are becoming increasingly able to talk openly about racial conflict and to appreciate each other's differences.

Parents/Community

Parents and community members are actively involved in the schools in various formal and informal ever-changing ways. PTA's have taken an aggressive approach in terms of their participation; as a result, though they may still hold picnics and flea markets, their major concerns tend more toward constant communication with staff members and a decision-making voice in how the schools operate. The city-wide PTA Council reflects the racial composition of the district as do most local PTA's (Chicano's, however, do not appear to be well represented), with a black Chairwoman, and several other minority officers. The level of discussions at one meeting of this council indicated a willingness to investigate issues and to perservere in any efforts to bring about change. Parents now sit on most administrative decision-making committees, and the Council Chairwoman's attitude that the only way to maintain reform is to "reform the reformer," seems to have resulted in a child-parent advocacy position on the part of many of those involved.

Not all parents have chosen the PTA as their channel for participation, though a newly-instituted decentralized budget procedure will provide increased parental input at this level. Recently, in-school participation has become the main arena for parental involvement. The doors of all schools are open (though, due to variations in the complexion of principal-teacher-parent relationships, some are "more open than others"), and parents can be seen helping in class, tutoring outside the classroom; assisting in special centers; taking a group of children on a trip, or observing classes to decide which one they wish to choose for their children in the following year. The introduction of parents as paid instructional aides in the mid-60's gave

impetus to this development, and 150 aides in today's classrooms do provide additional and continued community input. More and more men are taking a role, both in in-school and in organizational affairs, a trend that Berkeley's vocal female "minority group" enthusiastically supports. Day-to-day parent involvement at the secondary level is still much less prevalent than in the elementary schools.

While the NAACP, CORE, and other civil rights and parent groups initiated and took an active part in the desegregation planning, they have not felt it necessary to continue such an intensive involvement in the schools. "The Morning After" sheet summarizing board meetings is widely disseminated; board activities and decisions are a frequent topic of conversation; and many community members active in the schools serve in other organizations. In these informal ways, community groups keep informed and able to support or oppose school policies and procedures.

But what of many of the black and Chicano parents who are not interested in joining organizations and attending meetings where articulate verbalizations prolong all decisions? As these people prefer less verbalization and more decisive actions, they frequently cease to attend such meetings. A part of the current focus on the elimination of racism is to ask "why" do they stop participating and "how" can we work so that all styles and value systems can cooperate in a truly pluralistic parent parent participation effort. Though asnwers are not easily found, phrasing such questions is a big step forward.

Funding

Berkeley's total school budget for 1970-71 was $25,207,903 and for 1971-72 was projected at $ 26,479,386, including $ 4,325,379 from state, federal and private agencies. Cost per pupil was estimated at approximately $ 1,800, a figure far above the state norm of $ 765. The current push in California to redistribute school funds more equitably across the state could have a significant impact on Berkeley's school program, though its tradition of securing outside funding for supplemental programs could help maintain its current standard.

In calculating the financial costs of desegregation, it is difficult to definitely attribute expenses to many of the informal aspects of the process. However, the best estimates are that in 1968-69, the first year of elementary desegregation, the total cost of desegregation was approximately $ 518,140 (2.6% of the 1968-69 total budget of $19,400,000): $ 110,000 went to transportation, $ 124,000 to special facilities in 4-6 schools, and the balance to equipment relocation, classrooms, and other items.

Since the special costs for equipment relocation and classrooms were one-time expenditures, this percentage has dropped significantly. In 1970-71 the district paid $ 178,670 for busing out of total desegregation expenditures of $ 325,670. The rest was reimbursed by the state. Since the "special facilities" itemized above were needed to improve basic skills no matter what the ethnic makeup of a school, this cost should not be listed as a "desegregation" expense. Busing's share of the total budget in 1970-71 was less than 1%. Early fears that the cost of busing would necessitate a reduction in other services proved ill-founded. Indeed, many attribute Berkeley's success in receiving substantial outside grants for

increased services in large part to its commitment of integrated, quality education.

Formal Evaluation

Evaluation documents are available giving reading achievement figures for all grade levels for the two years prior to and following desegregation. In grades one, two and three, the highest scores on these standardized tests made at the median measuring point and at the mean by whites, blacks and Asians were made either in 1969 or in 1970, the two post-integration years. Due to a change in the test used in grades 4, 5, and 6, trends are less clear. Mean reading scores at all three of these levels showed a decline in 1969, but 1970 scores showed an improvement, and this trend appeared to continue in 1971. Examining the mean growth scores of total groups of second through fifth readers for the two years 1967-68 and 1968-69, it is clear that the greatest advantage of integration over segregation has been demonstrated by second graders, with progressively less advantage shown by third, fourth and fifth graders.

Trends exhibited in these statistics are not strong enough, nor is there sufficient longitudinal data available to generalize as to the effects of desegregation on student reading scores. Available figures for the entire school system for the years since junior high school desegregation indicate some improvement but little change in the pattern of the scores. Most disturbing in this realm is the fact that the lower quartile groups, consisting of predominantly black and Chicano youngsters, continue to score very low on reading, math and language tests, with the gap increasing as the children move through the grades. While this is not an unusual

pattern in USA 1972, it is one that Berkeley is trying to alter.

As there are no attitude tests which can be administered with a minimum of time, expense, and effort, there are no objective data available on attitudes or similar noncognitive variables. The increased communication between ethnic groups and the new-found willingness to discuss issues of race openly in class lead one to believe that, were such a valid test available, Berkeley youngsters would have illustrated non cognitive gains resulting from desegregation.

Problems

Most of Berkeley's problems in 1972 are those that any school system in transition from desegregation to pluralism and integration should expect to encounter. The "institutional racism" cited by the board recently and mentioned in several contexts in this report is the umbrella under which many of these problems fall. For example, the failure to set aside adequate staff time and effort for curricula development prior to desegregation has contributed to the concern of many staff members that they are ill-prepared to teach heterogeneous classes. Teachers believe that, had they been given more preparation in terms of such development and in terms of observation of and practice in working with the individualization which must accompany such heterogeneity, they would feel better prepared to assess and respond to each child's needs while avoiding at all costs the temptation to lower their standards for minority children. This tendency to expect less of these children still exists among some Berkeley staff members, though it is apt to be unconscious and to manifest itself in subtle ways.

Though both black and Oriental minority communities appear to take an active role in parental and extracurricular inputs, the Chicano community, smaller in number and not totally represented in staffing or programming, still seems to be the least understood and the least vocal in carving tis role in the development of a pluralistic school system.

Many parents fear that the bright, gifted children in Berkeley would not receive enough attention once the schools desegregated, and these fears still exist. Test results appear to refute this argument against desegregation, but parents are rarely satisfied with such data. However, just as those most lacking in basic skills are still not being adequately helped by the school system, it is possible that the more capable youngsters could be developing even more rapidly than at present.

The one-year ninth grade school which came into existence with junior high desegregation in 1964 has had a difficult time establishing an identity as anything other than a transitory stop between junior high and high school. While the morale at this site varies from class to class and staff to staff, the one-year situation will continue to leave a great deal to be desired in terms of continuity.

Nor has continuity between school levels been adequately emphasized. For example, a K-3 principal has no idea what the discipline procedures are in the 4-6 school "his" children will attend. A 4-6 principal laments the fact that children who have been in one class several years frequently develop inter-racial friendships, may be scattered in all directions once they reach junior high. There is not systematic follow-through on the high school campus for those students who have gained in self-esteem in the 9th grade West Campus alternative which provides employment in connection with studies. More communication, though difficult to channel in a large

system, would be profitable, both on informal and more formal levels.

Such communication may be one small way of getting at the issue of social separation among Berkeley students. This separation by races is, however, a reflection of society at large and would be true to some degree in any system. The fact that the separation is transitory and far-from-complete for most students does help to put Berkeley's problems in perspective vis-a-vis the rest of the country.

Why it is Exemplary

During the years of planning prior to desegregation, Berkeley's politically aware articulate black minority representatives and its white community, a large part of which is liberal and socially conscious, lent support to the superintendent and the board in their decisive stance. Throughout constant meetings, staff and community were not only kept informed, but actively involved in the planning. While such involvement is always espoused in theory, it is frequently ignored in practice. The lack of a "white flight" can be partially attributed to this thorough planning and involvement and partially to the desire of many whites to prove that the public schools would and could remain of high quality.

The cooperation in concern for children is reflected in many ways as one walks through schools and talks with teachers, administrators and parents. It is reflected in the quality of individualization one sees in most classrooms; in the openness of schools to parents and volunteers

and the choice of classroom styles given to parents; and in the thrust to try alternatives and to secure outside funding to do so. The openness to change which permeates the entire community provides a basis for experimentation free of the unarticulated threat that often accompanies educationally-related change.

The formulation of a truly pluralistic system as a model goal is more difficult to analyze. It is perhaps here that the real key to success lies. Increasing minority staff at all levels and positions is a necessary prerequisite for the introduction of such a system. A willingness to acknowledge the existence of institutional racism in all its subtle manifestations and to try to discuss it and work to eliminate it is another prerequisite. A high caliber of people is required to bring public attention to such issues; and this type of person has been attracted to the Berkeley school system. Berkeley is working on these in an atmosphere which has, for the most part, been accepting of school desegregation as a first and necessary step toward integrated, quality education.

Effectiveness

In contrast to Orangeburg, South Carolina and other cities where desegragation resulted from court orders, the desegregation effort at Berkeley came about through voluntary action by the Board of Education and generally enjoyed public support. Nonetheless, the elements of an effective desegregation effort recognized to be facilitative of the process still apply. These are: (1) preparation for desegregation; (2) effective

communications; (3) firm policy enunciation and support; and (4) educational innovations in service to children. Berkeley more than meets these requirements. A very active program of community education and preparation was implemented. This included a series of community meetings and summer workshops as well as the establishment of a monthly newspaper, "Help" centers, and a Speakers' Bureau. The board's policy decision was clearly enunciated and, in this instance, received considerable support from the community. Once the process was in progress, effort was directed at maintaining open lines of communication. The educational program at Berkeley emphasizes an individualized, personalized approach to instruction. There is an attempt to make the schools responsive to the diversity in the school population. Special features of the program include attention to black studies and bicultural education.

In a system where major efforts need not be directed at convincing and moving a recalcitrant community, greater attention can be given to the task of integration as opposed to the task of desegregation. In judging the progress of such a system, the following criteria are useful:

(1) position of the project along the continuum of desegregation-integration

(2) types of pedagogical strategies

(3) administrative and decision-making procedures

(4) political-social-psychological dynamics of change

(5) reactions to the process (as reflected in attitudes and behavior).

As far as the black students are concerned, Berkeley appears to be moving in the right direction. Considerable progress has been made in

the reorganization of the elementary schools so that the distribution of students in these schools more closely matches the multi-ethnic character of the district. Because there is a commitment to fostering the development of all children, it has been possible to maintain a relatively high degree of ethnic mix in the classes of the several elementary schools. Unfortunately, the momentum toward integration reflected in the elementary grades may be being lost at the high school level where it appears the more traditional patterns of personal-social interaction and the problems of differential levels of achievement are operating to separate students by ethnic group. Fortunately, however, the commitment to integration continues to be reflected in the curriculum at all levels. At the secondary level, among the options available to students are study in the Black House or the Casa de la Raza for Chicanos, where, in additon to the traditional high school curriculum, great effort is invested in the presentation and utilization of materials and experiences reflective of black and Chicano culture.

Several elements of the educational program summarized here and described in greater detail in the body of the report reflect the emphasis on pedagogical strategies in support of desegregation. With respect to decision-making procedures, the system has maintained access to decision-makers for all elements in the community. However, the better organization of the black community and the fact that it is more vocal than the Chicano community seems to have resulted in the Chicanos being under-represented in administrative decision-making processes. The fact that the district voted to increase taxes in order to support the schools, together with the fact of continued tax support from the citizens, indicate the positive character of the political-social dynamics of the community. This

may not be so much a result of the effort at desegregation as it is a reflection of the climate in which it has occurred. A review of the reactions to the desegregation process results in positive and negative findings.

Berkeley seems to have done most things right. It has made a substantial effort at making its program work. Yet, reviewed against the ideal of integration and democratic pluralism, it cannot be said that the Berkeley schools have solved the problem. Achievement differentials between groups have not been eliminated, although achievement patterns for minority groups are on the incline; the reception of minority group students in the secondary schools and the adequacy of their treatment are questioned by some; the commitment of the staff to an honest respect for pluralism appears to be modest. In other words, the Berkeley schools still function in a society where differences in ethnic background operate to the advantage of some and the disadvantage of others. This reminds us of the fact that school desegregation-integration is a partial solution to a broader problem. Since we are stuck with partial solutions, the model of the Berkeley experience is commended to persons seriously concerned with the implementation of desegregation.